

REMARKS:

Claims 91-149 are in the case and presented for reconsideration with the filing of this Amendment with an RCE.

Claims 91-106 include subject matter formerly presented in claims 76, 77, 54-66 and 81, but amended to require a nitrogen containing intermediate layer.

Claim 107-149 are based on former claims 82-88 but amended to include the product limitations of the Claim 1 in U.S. Patent 5,965,228, which was granted on the parent to the present application. Claim 107 has also been amended to eliminate the materials called for in old claims 76 and 77. Some of the new dependant claims define methods corresponding to some of the dependant claims in U.S. Patent 5,965,228.

Former claim 77 and certain claims dependant thereon have been rejected as being obvious from Imaino et al. (EP '885) in view of Takurou et al. (JP '017), IBM Tech. Disclosure Bulletin, Vol. 28, pg. 301 (IBM) or Ishihara et al. (US '699).

Former claim 76 has being rejected as obvious from Imaino in view of Tawara (EP '492) and Kim (UP '581).

The Examiner holds that the difference between the claimed invention and Imaino et al. is that Imaino et al. does not disclose controlling the amount of C or H that is present in the SiC or SiCH of the intermediate layer between data interfaces. However, Imaino et al. does not appear the use SiC or SiCH or even SiN at all (see Imaino at page 5, line 23-42; in the Imaino formula A_xB_{1-x} , B can be N but Si is not given as a possible for A). The secondary references, where they control gas flow in sputtering, do so for making other products with different requirements. The skilled artisan therefor has insufficient motivation to combine Imaino with any one or more of the secondary references to reach the invention in an obvious manner.

The motivation to deposit SiN in the intermediate layer between two information interfaces is not believed to exist in Imaino or Tawara or Kim. The requirements are different because the desired end products are different.

The prior art taken separately or in any combination is believed to be insufficient to teach the usefulness of the nitrogen compounds in the method of the invention as defined in Claims 91 to 106. Claim 107 to 149 are also believed to be patentable distinct over the prior art.

By this amendment, the application and claims are beleived
to be in condition for allowance and favorable action is
respectfully requested.

Dated: October 22, 2001

Respectfully submitted,



Peter C. Michalos
Reg. No. 28,643
Attorney for Applicants
(212) 564-0200

PCM:pae

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
Empire State Building
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 6902
New York, New York 10118-6985

M:\TEXT\Pat-Amd\H60-056.af